

A Search for Intrinsic Polarization in O Stars with Variable Winds

David McDavid¹

Limber Observatory, Timber Creek Road, P.O. Box 63599, Pipe Creek, Texas 78063-3599

mcdavid@limber.org

ABSTRACT

New observations of 9 of the brightest northern O stars have been made with the Breger polarimeter (Breger 1979) on the 0.9 m telescope at McDonald Observatory and the AnyPol polarimeter (McDavid 1999) on the 0.4 m telescope at Limber Observatory, using the Johnson-Cousins *UBVRI* broadband filter system. Comparison with earlier measurements shows no clearly defined long-term polarization variability. For all 9 stars the wavelength dependence of the degree of polarization in the optical range can be fit by a normal interstellar polarization law. The polarization position angles are practically constant with wavelength and are consistent with those of neighboring stars. Thus the simplest conclusion is that the polarization of all the program stars is primarily interstellar.

The O stars chosen for this study are generally known from ultraviolet and optical spectroscopy to have substantial mass loss rates and variable winds, as well as occasional circumstellar emission. Their lack of intrinsic polarization in comparison with the similar Be stars may be explained by the dominance of radiation as a wind driving force due to higher luminosity, which results in lower density and less rotational flattening in the electron scattering inner envelopes where the polarization is produced. However, time series of polarization measurements taken simultaneously with H α and UV spectroscopy during several coordinated multiwavelength campaigns suggest two cases of possible small-amplitude, periodic short-term polarization variability, and therefore intrinsic polarization, which may be correlated with the more widely recognized spectroscopic variations.

Subject headings: stars:early-type — stars:rotation — stars:winds,outflows — techniques:polarimetric

1. Introduction

While it is well understood that the luminosities of O stars are high enough to cause mass loss in the form of radiation-driven winds, it is not so easily understood that the outflows are observed

¹Guest Observer, McDonald Observatory, The University of Texas at Austin.

to be both episodically and also periodically or quasi-periodically variable (Kaper & Fullerton 1998). By analogy with the slightly cooler Be stars, it might be expected that the winds of the most rapidly rotating O stars would be equatorially concentrated, even if the lower densities and higher velocities were to prevent the formation of equatorial disks. It is then plausible that the scattering of light from the central star by free electrons in the envelope or in the wind might lead to a measurable polarization if the degree of rotational flattening were sufficient and the orientation favorable. Polarimetric observations are therefore a valuable asset in the study of O-star winds, particularly as an indicator of the geometrical distribution of the outflowing material.

The discovery that most O stars exhibit deep-seated spectroscopic variability (Fullerton, Gies, & Bolton 1996) opened up the tantalizing possibility that photospheric activity may modulate the stellar wind by acting at its base. At nearly the same time, exploratory observations of O stars with *IUE* revealed spectral features (discrete absorption components, or DACs) accelerating blueward across the profiles of UV resonance lines, as if tracing the outflow of density perturbations in the wind (Prinja & Howarth 1986). Thus began a series of international multiwavelength observing campaigns extending over several years (McDavid 1994), using *IUE* together with simultaneous high resolution optical spectroscopy, photometry, and polarimetry at various ground-based observatories, in a search for “the photospheric connection”: observational evidence that wind variations are directly linked to stellar surface activity. As a sensitive technique for monitoring conditions in the inner wind regions, polarimetry had a natural role to play in these observing campaigns, and the purpose of this paper is to presents the results. Some later followup observations are also included.

2. Collected Data

The program stars and relevant data are listed in Table 1. Tables 2–10 contain the results of a literature search for observations of each star, followed by new observations which have not been previously published. The reference codes given in parentheses immediately after the dates of observation are as follows: (1) Mathewson et al. 1978; (2a) Coyne & Gehrels 1966; (2b) Serkowski, Gehrels, & Wisniewski 1969; (2c) Gehrels 1974; (3a) Hayes 1975; (3b) Hayes 1978; (3c) Hayes 1984; (4) Poeckert, Bastien, & Landstreet 1979; (5) Lupie & Nordsieck 1987; (6) McDavid (McDonald Observatory, previously unpublished); (7) McDavid (Limber Observatory, previously unpublished).

Where multiple measurements were available, the normalized Stokes parameters q and u , the degree p of polarization, and the equatorial position angle θ are the means of the given number n of individual measurements, and dq , du , dp , and $d\theta$ are the associated standard deviations. Results are presented for p and θ to help distinguish between variability in the degree of polarization and variability of the position angle, even though these parameters are not normally distributed (Clarke & Stewart 1986). For single measurements (1, 2c) and some cases of only two measurements (2a, 2b), dq , du , dp , and $d\theta$ are simply representative error estimates, usually based on repeatability of frequent observations of standard stars. In many references q and u were not given, so they were calculated as $q = p \cos 2\theta$, $u = p \sin 2\theta$, and $dq = du = dp$ for the sake of statistical completeness.

In cases where $d\theta$ was missing, it was estimated as $28.65(dp/p)$. The quantities dpi and $d\theta i$ are estimates of the uncertainty in a single measurement, which are sometimes equivalent to the “representative error estimates” mentioned above (1,2), sometimes derived from the residuals of the fits used in the data reduction procedure (4,5), and sometimes calculated from photon counting statistics (3, 6). For the Limber Observatory data (7) a single measurement and its error are the mean and standard deviation of three repetitions.

3. Long-Term Analysis: The Interstellar Component

Simple inspection of Tables 2–10 is all that is necessary to see that there is no compelling evidence for long-term variable polarization at the 3σ level for any of the program stars. The complete data set is far too heterogeneous and the sample sizes far too small to expect any meaningful result from application of a rigorous analysis of variance with F-test probabilities. Relaxing the requirements, but still in search of a more quantitative conclusion, Table 11 was constructed as a statistical summary of the data on all of the program stars. This was done by calculating the mean and standard deviation of q , u , p , and θ over the subsets of observations for each of the stars (columns 2, 4, 6, and 8), averaging the standard deviations from each subset (bracketed quantities in columns 3, 5, 7, and 9), and averaging the error estimates for a single observation (bracketed quantities in columns 10 and 11).

It is then quite clear that the overall scatter dq , du , dp , and $d\theta$ from combining individual data subsets is never substantially greater than would be expected on average as seen in $\langle dq \rangle$, $\langle du \rangle$, $\langle dp \rangle$, and $\langle d\theta \rangle$ or, alternatively, as seen in $\langle dpi \rangle$ and $\langle d\theta i \rangle$. The Grand Averages over all 5 passbands (in rows beginning with “GAV”), based on the expectation that any variations should appear more or less in all filters, further demonstrate the absence of any detectable variability.

Can we use Table 11 to make a quantitative statement about the amplitude of genuine variability that would escape detection in this study, as well as an amplitude of variability that would surely be detected? A conservative criterion for the break point would be the average of the Grand Averages of dp over all the stars in Table 11, which is 0.07%. Smaller variations might be completely hidden, and the threshold for 3σ detection would be 0.21%. Compared to state-of-the-art precision on the order of 0.02% this may seem to be a weak result, but considering that it was obtained from the combination of at least seven different instrumental systems over a span of 40 years, it is a perfectly realistic conclusion that none of the program stars has varied substantially. This absence of variability constitutes strong evidence that the polarization is predominantly interstellar.

To continue the test for an interstellar origin of the polarization, a Serkowski law of the modified form $p(\lambda) = p_{max} \exp[-1.7\lambda_{max} \ln^2(\lambda_{max}/\lambda)]$ found by Whittet et al. (1992) was fitted to the *UBVRI* data on each star by weighted nonlinear least squares. The latest Limber Observatory observations were used because they comprise the most uniform data set. The top panels of Figures 1–9 show the results, including the fit parameters. Since the best fit values of λ_{max} generally

fall within the normal range of $0.45\ \mu\text{m}$ to $0.8\ \mu\text{m}$ (Serkowski, Mathewson, & Ford 1975), this experiment can be taken to support the interpretation of the polarization as interstellar.

The middle panels of Figures 1–9 show the polarization of the program star and neighboring stars taken from the agglomeration catalog of Heiles (1999), superimposed on the *IRAS* $100\ \mu\text{m}$ survey image, which traces the interstellar dust. In most cases the position angle of the program star is similar to those of its neighbors, as would be expected if all the stars are polarized by selective extinction due to a locally uniform alignment of the interstellar dust grains (Aannestad & Greenberg 1983).

The bottom panels of Figures 1–9 show the *UBVRI* polarization of the program star plotted as 1σ confidence ellipses in the q, u plane. A solid line is drawn through the origin at the average of the *UBVRI* position angles. For comparison, a dashed line is drawn showing the best straight-line fit to the *UBVRI* data points. These two lines will coincide if the position angle of the polarization is independent of wavelength, which is expected if it is purely interstellar. The shaded region is centered on the mean polarization position angle of the neighboring stars, extended by one standard deviation on either side, and defines the region of agreement between the position angle of the program star and those of the neighboring stars. The figures clearly show that the solid and dashed lines generally match well, with the greatest differences occurring when the degree of polarization is small and the position angle therefore poorly defined. In all cases except 19 Cep, which has only a negligible mismatch, the solid and dashed lines fall within the shaded regions.

To summarize, four arguments imply that the polarization of all 9 program stars is interstellar: (1) No long-term variability has ever been detected. (2) The wavelength dependence of the polarization follows a Serkowski law typical of interstellar polarization. (3) The position angle of the polarization is independent of wavelength. (4) The position angle is consistent with those of neighboring stars.

In spite of this evidence against intrinsic polarization, it should be mentioned that there have also been some investigations resulting in its favor. Hayes (1975) made rigorous statistical analyses on his polarization measurements of several O stars with dense monitoring coverage over periods of months and concluded that λ Cep (Hayes 1978) and α Cam (Hayes 1984) were variable at the 3σ level. He gave convincing proof of instrumental stability to the photon counting limit of $\sim 0.02\%$, which justified his detection of variability at levels of 0.06% to 0.08% . In a later study Lupie & Nordsieck (1987) found evidence for spectropolarimetric variability of the same two stars with only a slightly lower level of signal to noise.

As another example of the evidence for intrinsic polarization in emission-line O stars, Harries and Howarth (1996) discovered a spectropolarimetric change across the $\text{H}\alpha$ emission line of ζ Pup, which implies a polarizing wind asymmetry. Also, Ebbets (1981) summarized the $\text{H}\alpha$ emission episodes of ζ Oph, which seem to have escaped polarimetric observation but might well have included polarization effects (Reid et al. 1993). The x-ray outburst of ζ Ori (Berghöfer & Schmitt 1994), which was attributed to a propagating wind shock, also escaped polarimetric observation.

4. Short-Term Analysis: Hints of Cyclic Variability

Most of the program stars were monitored at McDonald Observatory in conjunction with simultaneous ultraviolet and optical spectroscopy during several roughly week-long campaigns from 1986 through 1992. These time series are identifiable in Tables 2–10 by entries with large numbers of individual measurements, where only the averages are given. With a typical instrumental uncertainty of about 0.03% for a single observation, no polarization variability was detected at the 3σ level for any of the series (McDavid 1998). However, during the campaign of October 1991, both 68 Cyg and ξ Per showed small-amplitude periodicities in polarization which are a priori significant because they match those found by Kaper et al. (1997) in the simultaneous optical and ultraviolet spectra. These variations constitute evidence for intrinsic polarization of a form that could have very easily escaped detection in the long-term monitoring discussed earlier in this paper, but their reality should be regarded as tentative.

A CLEANed Fourier periodogram (Roberts, Lehar, & Dreher 1987) of the polarization of 68 Cyg using 15 iterations at a gain of 0.9 shows maximum power at $0.75 \pm 0.03 \text{ d}^{-1}$ (period 1.33 d), equal to the frequency of both the $\text{H}\alpha$ and Si IV equivalent widths. The amplitude of this variation is about 0.045% (see Figure 10). Interestingly, the polarization is in antiphase with the $\text{H}\alpha$ EW, exactly as expected in the corotating interaction region (CIR) model applied to O-star winds (Cranmer & Owocki 1996). The notes in Figure 11 give a qualitative plausibility argument for how this might come about. For a thorough theoretical treatment see Harries (1999). Assuming a radius of $14R_{\odot}$ and an inclination of 90° , the rotation period of 68 Cyg is 2.59 d. This gives two cycles per rotation, also in agreement with the CIR model with two diametrically opposite equatorial bright areas.

The case of ξ Per is more complicated. Kaper et al. (1997) found the $\text{H}\alpha$ and Si IV EWs to vary with a frequency of $0.50 \pm 0.10 \text{ d}^{-1}$ (period 2.0 d) and also noted the presence of another $\text{H}\alpha$ frequency at $1.12 \pm 0.03 \text{ d}^{-1}$ (period 0.89 d), which they interpreted as a harmonic. As shown in Figure 12, the simultaneous polarimetry shows exactly this frequency, with an amplitude of about 0.025%. Assuming a radius of $11R_{\odot}$, the rotation period of ξ Per is less than about 2.78 d, depending on the inclination. It is possible, then, that the 2.0 d period is the rotation period, in which case ξ Per had only one photospheric bright area and associated CIR structure at the time of the observations. This would result in one EW cycle per rotation, but two polarization cycles, as observed.

5. Conclusions

This study has illustrated that intrinsic polarization in O stars is clearly a rare phenomenon in spite of the similarity between emission-line O stars and the cooler and less luminous Be stars, which have well-known intrinsic polarization. Both classes of stars have significant mass loss in the form of variable winds, but the origin of the variability is still poorly understood. It seems a likely

conclusion that the long-lived flattened envelopes or disks characteristic of Be stars almost never form around even the most rapidly rotating O stars because the circumstellar regions of O stars are more completely swept out by their stronger, luminosity-driven winds. The only indications of variable polarization found in the O stars are weak suggestions of rapid cycles on the time scale of the stellar rotation period (a few days at most) which appear to involve wind density patterns that change aspect with rotation.

The O stars presented here deserve continued long-term polarization monitoring for the type of outburst behavior seen in ζ Oph and ζ Ori. Further pursuit of the suspected rapid cyclic variations, however, is likely to require dense time-series polarimetry of unprecedented precision, with random errors not to exceed 0.01%.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank my friends and coworkers on the “O-Team”: Tom Bolton, Doug Gies, Alex Fullerton, and Huib Henrichs, for their enthusiasm and encouragement. We were all inspired by the work of Andy Reid and Lex Kaper, who dispelled some of our skepticism and showed us the value of our observations. I also appreciate the advice of Dietrich Baade and Ian Howarth, who both took the time to read and comment on early versions of this paper.

I am grateful to the administration of McDonald Observatory for generous allotments of observing time, as well as to Ed Dutchover and the rest of the technical staff for maintaining the Breger polarimeter in stable working order for year after year.

This research has made use of the SIMBAD database, operated at CDS, Strasbourg, France. I acknowledge the use of NASA’s *SkyView* facility (<http://skyview.gsfc.nasa.gov>) located at NASA Goddard Space Flight Center.

REFERENCES

- Aannestad, P.A. & Greenberg, J.M. 1983, ApJ, 272, 551
Berghöfer, T.W. & Schmitt, J.H.M.M. 1994, Science, 265, 1689
Breger, M. 1979, ApJ, 233, 97
Clarke, D. & Stewart, B.G. 1986, Vistas Astron., 29, 27
Conti, P.S. & Ebbets, D. 1977, ApJ, 213, 438
Coyne, G.V. & Gehrels, T. 1966, AJ, 71, 355 (2a)
Cranmer, S.R. & Owocki, S.P. 1996, ApJ, 462, 469
Ebbets, D. 1981, PASP, 93, 119
Fullerton, A.W., Gies, D.R., & Bolton, C.T. 1996, ApJS, 103, 475
Gehrels, T. 1974, AJ, 79, 590 (2c)

- Harries, T.J. 1999, in preparation
- Harries, T.J. & Howarth, I.D. 1996, *A&A*, 310, 533
- Hayes, D.P. 1975, *ApJ*, 197, L55 (3a)
- Hayes, D.P. 1978, *ApJ*, 219, 952 (3b)
- Hayes, D.P. 1984, *AJ*, 89, 1219 (3c)
- Heiles, C. 1999, in preparation
- Hoffleit, D. & Jaschek, C. 1982, *The Bright Star Catalog* (4th ed.) (New Haven: Yale University Observatory)
- Howarth, I.D. & Prinja, R. 1989, *ApJ*, 69, 527
- Howarth, I.D., Siebert, K.W., Hussain, G.A.J., & Prinja, R.K. 1997, *MNRAS*, 284, 265
- Kaper, L. & Fullerton, A.W., eds. 1998, *Cyclic Variability in Stellar Winds*, Proceedings of the ESO Workshop (Berlin: Springer-Verlag)
- Kaper, L., Henrichs, H.F., Fullerton, A.W., Ando, H., Bjorkman, K.S., Gies, D.R., Hirata, R., Kambe, E., McDavid, D., & Nichols, J.S. 1997, *A&A*, 327, 281
- Lupie, O.L. & Nordsieck, K.H. 1987, *AJ*, 92, 214 (5)
- Mathewson, D.S., Ford, V.I., Klare, G., Neckel, Th., & Krautter, J. 1978, *BICDS*, 14, 115
- McDavid, D. 1994, in *Pulsation, Rotation and Mass Loss in Early-Type Stars*, Proceedings of IAU Symposium 162, eds. L.A. Balona, H.F. Henrichs, and J.M. Le Contel (Dordrecht: Kluwer), 530
- McDavid, D. 1998, in *Cyclic Variability in Stellar Winds*, Proceedings of the ESO Workshop, eds. L. Kaper & A.W. Fullerton (Berlin: Springer-Verlag), 108
- McDavid, D. 1999, *PASP*, 111, 494
- Poeckert, R., Bastien, P., & Landstreet, J.D. 1979, *AJ*, 84, 812 (4)
- Prinja, R.K. & Howarth, I.D. 1986, *ApJS*, 61, 357
- Reid, A.H.N., Bolton, C.T., Crowe, R.A., Fieldus, M.S., Fullerton, A.W., Gies, D.R., Howarth, I.D., McDavid, D., Prinja, R.K., & Smith, K.C. 1993, *ApJ*, 417, 320
- Roberts, D.H., Lehar, J., & Dreher, J.W. 1987, *AJ*, 93, 968
- Serkowski, K., Gehrels, T., & Wisniewski, W. 1969, *AJ*, 74, 85 (2b)
- Serkowski, K., Mathewson, D.S., & Ford, V.L. 1975, *ApJ*, 196, 261
- Walborn, N.R. 1972, *AJ*, 77, 312
- Walborn, N.R. 1973, *AJ*, 78, 1067

Whittet, D.C.B., Martin, P.G., Hough, J.H., Rouse, M.F., Bailey, J.A., & Axon, D.J. 1992, ApJ, 386, 562

Fig. 1.— (top panel): Revised Serkowski law fit to the *UBVRI* polarization of ξ Per, showing values of the parameters p_{max} and λ_{max} . (middle panel): *IRAS* 100 μ m image, centered on the program star, showing polarization of neighboring stars. North is up and East is left. (bottom panel): q, u plot with analysis of the *UBVRI* polarization position angles. See §3 for further explanation.

Fig. 2.— Same as Fig. 1, only for α Cam.

Fig. 3.— Same as Fig. 1, only for λ Ori.

Fig. 4.— Same as Fig. 1, only for ζ Ori.

Fig. 5.— Same as Fig. 1, only for ζ Oph.

Fig. 6.— Same as Fig. 1, only for 68 Cyg.

Fig. 7.— Same as Fig. 1, only for 19 Cep.

Fig. 8.— Same as Fig. 1, only for λ Cep.

Fig. 9.— Same as Fig. 1, only for 10 Lac.

Fig. 10.— Correlations among cycles in the equivalent widths of Si IV and H α and the polarization of 68 Cyg during the campaign of October 1991, adapted from Kaper et al. (1997).

Fig. 11.— Illustration of the CIR model for a hot-star wind, with annotations explaining qualitatively the expected relations among Si IV and H α equivalent widths and the polarization when viewed from different directions, adapted from Cranmer & Owocki (1996).

Fig. 12.— Correlations among cycles in the equivalent widths of Si IV and H α and the polarization of ξ Per during the campaign of October 1991, adapted from Kaper et al. (1997).

Table 1. Program Stars

HD	Name	V^a (mag)	Spectral Type ^b	R^c ($R_\odot$)	T_{eff}^c (K)	$\log L^c$ ($L_\odot$)	Dist ^d (pc)	$v \sin i^e$ (km s ⁻¹)
24912	ξ Per	4.04	O7.5 III(n)((f))	11	36 000	5.3	457	213
30614	α Cam	4.29	O9.5 Ia	22	29 900	5.5	1088	129
36861	λ Ori	3.66	O8 III((f))	12	35 000	5.3	372	74
37742	ζ Ori	1.75	O9.7 Ib	29	30 000	5.8	332	124
149757	ζ Oph	2.56	O9.5 V	8	34 000	4.9	163	372
203064	68 Cyg	5.00	O7.5 III:n((f))	14	36 000	5.5	660	305
209975	19 Cep	5.11	O9.5 Ib	18	30 200	5.4	1090	95
210839	λ Cep	5.04	O6 I(n)fp	17	42 000	5.9	550	219
214680	10 Lac	4.88	O9 V	9	38 000	5.1	704	35

References. — (a) Hoffleit & Jaschek 1982; (b) Walborn 1972, 1973; (c) Howarth & Prinja 1989; (d) Heiles 1999; (e) Howarth et al. 1997

Table 2. ξ Per

Year(Source) Filter(n)	q/dq (%)	u/du (%)	p/dp (%)	$\theta/d\theta$ ($^\circ$)	dpi (%)	$d\theta i$ ($^\circ$)
1949–1958(1)						
$B(1)$	-1.12/0.20	-0.65/0.20	1.29/0.20	105.0/ 4.4	0.20	4.4
1966(2b)						
$U(2)$	-0.96/0.10	-0.66/0.10	1.16/0.10	107.2/ 2.0	0.10	2.0
$B(2)$	-1.09/0.10	-0.82/0.10	1.37/0.10	108.5/ 2.0	0.10	2.0
$V(2)$	-1.15/0.10	-0.89/0.10	1.46/0.10	108.9/ 2.0	0.10	2.0
$R(2)$	-1.19/0.10	-0.87/0.10	1.47/0.10	108.1/ 2.0	0.10	2.0
$I(2)$	-1.00/0.10	-0.75/0.10	1.25/0.10	108.5/ 2.0	0.10	2.0
1989.79(6)						
$U(6)$	-0.86/0.05	-0.60/0.06	1.05/0.03	107.4/ 1.9	0.04	1.1
$B(22)$	-0.98/0.03	-0.74/0.02	1.23/0.03	108.4/ 0.5	0.03	0.9
$V(6)$	-1.11/0.02	-0.83/0.06	1.39/0.03	108.4/ 1.1	0.03	1.3
$R(6)$	-1.12/0.03	-0.82/0.02	1.39/0.02	108.2/ 0.5	0.02	0.5
$I(6)$	-0.99/0.06	-0.74/0.08	1.24/0.05	108.4/ 2.0	0.05	1.1
1991.82(6)						
$V(15)$	-1.13/0.03	-0.85/0.02	1.41/0.02	108.5/ 0.6	0.02	0.5
1996.13(7)						
$U(1)$	-0.79/0.14	-0.59/0.14	0.99/0.20	108.2/ 1.0	0.20	1.0
$B(1)$	-0.96/0.01	-0.79/0.11	1.24/0.06	109.7/ 2.1	0.06	2.1
$V(1)$	-0.99/0.12	-0.79/0.06	1.28/0.06	109.4/ 2.7	0.06	2.7
$R(1)$	-1.14/0.12	-0.90/0.03	1.46/0.09	109.2/ 1.9	0.09	1.9
$I(1)$	-1.07/0.09	-0.76/0.14	1.32/0.01	107.8/ 3.6	0.01	3.6
1997.04(7)						
$U(4)$	-0.90/0.02	-0.56/0.08	1.06/0.04	106.1/ 1.8	0.10	1.9
$B(4)$	-0.95/0.05	-0.65/0.06	1.16/0.07	107.2/ 0.8	0.06	1.7
$V(4)$	-1.07/0.05	-0.74/0.10	1.30/0.09	107.2/ 1.4	0.05	1.1
$R(4)$	-1.06/0.05	-0.68/0.06	1.27/0.07	106.4/ 0.6	0.11	3.4
$I(4)$	-1.06/0.07	-0.65/0.07	1.24/0.05	105.7/ 2.1	0.11	2.0

Table 3. α Cam

Year(Source) Filter(n)	q/dq (%)	u/du (%)	p/dp (%)	$\theta/d\theta$ ($^\circ$)	dpi (%)	$d\theta i$ ($^\circ$)
1949–1958(1)						
$B(1)$	0.35/0.20	-1.62/0.20	1.66/0.20	141.0/ 3.4	0.20	3.4
1963–1965(2a)						
$U(2)$	0.20/0.08	-1.67/0.08	1.68/0.08	138.4/ 2.7	0.08	0.9
$B(2)$	0.25/0.08	-1.74/0.08	1.76/0.08	139.1/ 0.9	0.08	0.9
$V(2)$	0.22/0.08	-1.82/0.08	1.83/0.08	138.4/ 0.9	0.08	0.9
$R(2)$	0.10/0.08	-1.44/0.08	1.44/0.08	136.9/ 0.9	0.08	0.9
$I(2)$	0.04/0.08	-1.13/0.08	1.13/0.08	136.0/ 0.9	0.08	0.9
1978.8(3c)						
$B(41)$	0.16/0.08	-1.54/0.08	1.55/0.08	138.0/ 1.0	0.02	0.4
1979–1982(5)						
$V(8)$	0.01/0.07	-1.46/0.07	1.46/0.07	135.2/ 1.8	0.02	0.4
$R(8)$	0.02/0.15	-1.59/0.15	1.59/0.13	135.3/ 1.7	0.04	1.0
$I(8)$	0.04/0.05	-1.41/0.05	1.41/0.05	135.9/ 2.6	0.04	1.2
1997.10(7)						
$U(4)$	0.16/0.12	-1.37/0.16	1.39/0.15	138.4/ 2.7	0.14	2.7
$B(4)$	0.15/0.08	-1.51/0.10	1.52/0.09	137.9/ 1.6	0.06	1.4
$V(4)$	0.15/0.08	-1.47/0.09	1.48/0.09	137.9/ 1.7	0.07	1.3
$R(4)$	0.14/0.10	-1.39/0.16	1.40/0.16	137.9/ 2.0	0.06	1.7
$I(4)$	0.09/0.12	-1.16/0.12	1.18/0.12	137.4/ 2.7	0.06	4.0

Table 4. λ Ori

Year(Source) Filter(n)	q/dq (%)	u/du (%)	p/dp (%)	$\theta/d\theta$ ($^\circ$)	dpi (%)	$d\theta i$ ($^\circ$)
1949–1958(1)						
$B(1)$	-0.16/0.20	-0.20/0.20	0.26/0.20	116.0/22.0	0.20	22.0
1974.54(3a)						
$B(12)$	-0.23/0.02	-0.11/0.02	0.26/0.02	102.7/ 2.2	0.02	2.2
1992.86(6)						
$U(3)$	-0.22/0.02	-0.10/0.06	0.25/0.04	101.8/ 5.0	0.03	3.2
$B(3)$	-0.25/0.03	-0.14/0.03	0.29/0.02	105.0/ 3.0	0.02	1.8
$V(16)$	-0.27/0.04	-0.12/0.04	0.30/0.04	102.2/ 3.7	0.03	2.8
$R(3)$	-0.23/0.07	-0.10/0.02	0.25/0.07	102.2/ 1.9	0.02	2.3
$I(3)$	-0.23/0.02	-0.05/0.04	0.24/0.02	96.6/ 5.6	0.02	2.2
1997.10(7)						
$U(4)$	-0.25/0.03	-0.17/0.09	0.31/0.07	106.2/ 7.0	0.04	7.6
$B(4)$	-0.29/0.02	-0.22/0.08	0.38/0.06	108.9/ 5.5	0.04	9.1
$V(4)$	-0.24/0.04	-0.16/0.06	0.31/0.04	106.7/ 5.7	0.03	10.7
$R(4)$	-0.27/0.03	-0.13/0.09	0.32/0.05	102.0/ 8.0	0.04	8.4
$I(4)$	-0.27/0.07	-0.07/0.12	0.32/0.07	97.5/10.2	0.07	12.0

Table 5. ζ Ori

Year(Source) Filter(n)	q/dq (%)	u/du (%)	p/dp (%)	$\theta/d\theta$ ($^\circ$)	dpi (%)	$d\theta i$ ($^\circ$)
1949–1958(1)						
$B(1)$	-0.23/0.12	0.06/0.12	0.24/0.12	83.0/14.3	0.12	14.3
1979–1982(5)						
$V(3)$	-0.38/0.02	0.11/0.02	0.40/0.02	81.9/ 0.5	0.02	1.4
1992.86(6)						
$U(3)$	-0.15/0.02	0.10/0.01	0.18/0.02	72.8/ 2.3	0.01	2.1
$B(3)$	-0.12/0.04	0.14/0.02	0.19/0.01	65.7/ 6.7	0.01	1.4
$V(15)$	-0.19/0.04	0.12/0.04	0.23/0.03	73.5/ 5.5	0.03	3.6
$R(3)$	-0.21/0.04	0.08/0.01	0.22/0.04	79.6/ 1.6	0.01	1.2
$I(3)$	-0.11/0.03	0.19/0.03	0.22/0.04	59.8/ 3.1	0.02	2.9
1997.10(7)						
$U(4)$	-0.23/0.10	0.03/0.11	0.28/0.08	81.8/13.6	0.10	11.2
$B(4)$	-0.21/0.17	0.00/0.05	0.27/0.12	89.0/16.8	0.09	25.1
$V(4)$	-0.19/0.14	0.07/0.09	0.25/0.12	84.0/15.7	0.07	25.7
$R(4)$	-0.20/0.09	0.09/0.12	0.25/0.11	81.2/12.9	0.10	12.6
$I(4)$	-0.23/0.15	0.03/0.08	0.28/0.13	86.9/13.3	0.05	17.5

Table 6. ζ Oph

Year(Source) Filter(n)	q/dq (%)	u/du (%)	p/dp (%)	$\theta/d\theta$ ($^\circ$)	dpi (%)	$d\theta i$ ($^\circ$)
1949–1958(1)						
$B(1)$	-0.34/0.12	-1.37/0.12	1.41/0.12	128.0/ 2.4	0.12	2.4
1964–1966(2c)						
$U(1)$	-0.28/0.01	-1.08/0.01	1.12/0.01	127.8/ 0.3	0.01	0.3
$B(1)$	-0.32/0.02	-1.28/0.02	1.32/0.02	127.9/ 0.5	0.02	0.5
$V(1)$	-0.39/0.01	-1.43/0.01	1.48/0.01	127.4/ 0.1	0.01	0.1
$R(1)$	-0.40/0.01	-1.44/0.01	1.49/0.01	127.2/ 0.4	0.01	0.4
$I(1)$	-0.34/0.01	-1.24/0.01	1.29/0.01	127.3/ 0.2	0.01	0.2
1974.54(3a)						
$B(12)$	-0.33/0.02	-1.25/0.02	1.29/0.02	127.5/ 0.4	0.02	0.4
1976.4(4)						
$U(2)$	-0.24/0.12	-0.97/0.12	1.00/0.12	128.2/ 0.7	0.02	0.6
$B(2)$	-0.37/0.04	-1.13/0.04	1.17/0.04	127.4/ 0.2	0.02	0.5
$I(1)$	-0.38/0.01	-1.17/0.01	1.23/0.01	126.1/ 0.2	0.01	0.2
1981–1982(5)						
$V(6)$	-0.56/0.04	-1.31/0.04	1.43/0.04	123.4/ 1.1	0.03	0.6
$R(6)$	-0.60/0.04	-1.34/0.04	1.47/0.04	123.0/ 0.5	0.04	1.0
$I(6)$	-0.55/0.04	-1.29/0.05	1.40/0.04	123.4/ 1.4	0.04	1.1
1989.32(6)						
$B(5)$	-0.41/0.03	-1.28/0.05	1.35/0.06	126.2/ 0.2	0.03	0.6
$V(17)$	-0.50/0.03	-1.41/0.03	1.50/0.04	125.3/ 0.6	0.04	0.6
1992.71(6)						
$U(1)$	-0.26/0.04	-1.01/0.04	1.05/0.04	127.8/ 1.0	0.04	1.0
$B(1)$	-0.28/0.02	-1.34/0.02	1.37/0.02	129.0/ 0.4	0.02	0.4
$V(1)$	-0.56/0.02	-1.37/0.02	1.48/0.02	124.0/ 0.4	0.02	0.4
$R(1)$	-0.50/0.02	-1.40/0.02	1.49/0.02	125.1/ 0.3	0.02	0.3
$I(1)$	-0.56/0.04	-1.52/0.04	1.62/0.04	124.8/ 0.7	0.04	0.7
1996.35(7)						
$U(3)$	-0.28/0.02	-1.16/0.05	1.19/0.06	128.3/ 0.1	0.10	1.7
$B(3)$	-0.36/0.05	-1.26/0.03	1.31/0.02	127.1/ 1.2	0.04	1.1
$V(3)$	-0.41/0.02	-1.44/0.01	1.50/0.01	127.1/ 0.3	0.05	1.4
$R(3)$	-0.45/0.08	-1.32/0.05	1.40/0.07	125.7/ 1.4	0.06	1.0

Table 6—Continued

Year(Source) Filter(n)	q/dq (%)	u/du (%)	p/dp (%)	$\theta/d\theta$ ($^\circ$)	dpi (%)	$d\theta i$ ($^\circ$)
$I(3)$	-0.41/0.07	-1.29/0.06	1.36/0.04	126.0/ 1.7	0.08	2.6
1997.51(7)						
$U(3)$	-0.16/0.04	-1.04/0.07	1.05/0.07	130.7/ 1.3	0.06	2.0
$B(3)$	-0.31/0.05	-1.25/0.02	1.29/0.03	128.0/ 0.9	0.05	1.0
$V(3)$	-0.33/0.07	-1.39/0.04	1.44/0.02	128.2/ 1.5	0.06	1.2
$R(3)$	-0.31/0.04	-1.43/0.08	1.46/0.09	128.9/ 0.4	0.05	0.8
$I(3)$	-0.43/0.03	-1.24/0.09	1.31/0.09	125.5/ 0.8	0.08	1.5

Table 7. 68 Cyg

Year(Source) Filter(<i>n</i>)	q/dq (%)	u/du (%)	p/dp (%)	$\theta/d\theta$ ($^{\circ}$)	dpi (%)	$d\theta i$ ($^{\circ}$)
1949–1958(1)						
<i>B</i> (1)	-0.13/0.20	0.35/0.20	0.37/0.20	55.0/15.5	0.20	15.5
1986.65(6)						
<i>B</i> (3)	-0.28/0.02	0.49/0.02	0.57/0.02	60.0/ 0.8	0.01	0.4
<i>V</i> (10)	-0.27/0.02	0.54/0.02	0.61/0.02	58.4/ 1.3	0.01	0.6
1987.68(6)						
<i>V</i> (20)	-0.30/0.03	0.50/0.02	0.59/0.02	60.3/ 1.5	0.03	1.2
1991.82(6)						
<i>U</i> (3)	-0.32/0.02	0.40/0.04	0.51/0.04	64.1/ 1.0	0.01	0.6
<i>B</i> (3)	-0.38/0.05	0.44/0.08	0.59/0.04	65.3/ 4.5	0.01	0.5
<i>V</i> (17)	-0.40/0.02	0.50/0.03	0.64/0.02	64.3/ 1.4	0.03	1.7
<i>R</i> (3)	-0.40/0.04	0.44/0.04	0.60/0.05	66.1/ 1.3	0.01	0.6
<i>I</i> (3)	-0.42/0.07	0.40/0.02	0.58/0.06	68.0/ 2.2	0.04	2.0
1996.54(7)						
<i>U</i> (4)	-0.28/0.02	0.52/0.05	0.61/0.03	59.3/ 1.8	0.14	7.5
<i>B</i> (4)	-0.34/0.03	0.48/0.03	0.60/0.04	62.6/ 1.0	0.08	2.8
<i>V</i> (4)	-0.36/0.04	0.52/0.06	0.64/0.05	62.4/ 2.4	0.10	1.2
<i>R</i> (4)	-0.37/0.05	0.54/0.01	0.66/0.03	62.0/ 2.2	0.07	3.1
<i>I</i> (4)	-0.31/0.06	0.46/0.11	0.57/0.12	61.9/ 1.6	0.11	9.1
1997.53(7)						
<i>U</i> (3)	-0.23/0.09	0.50/0.08	0.56/0.07	57.5/ 4.9	0.13	5.6
<i>B</i> (3)	-0.32/0.02	0.45/0.03	0.56/0.02	62.7/ 1.8	0.07	3.1
<i>V</i> (3)	-0.39/0.05	0.51/0.06	0.65/0.03	64.1/ 3.2	0.06	3.5
<i>R</i> (3)	-0.34/0.04	0.47/0.07	0.58/0.05	62.9/ 2.8	0.05	2.2
<i>I</i> (3)	-0.34/0.06	0.49/0.08	0.60/0.07	62.0/ 2.9	0.13	3.6
1997.66(7)						
<i>V</i> (32)	-0.31/0.06	0.50/0.06	0.59/0.06	60.9/ 2.3	0.05	2.8

Table 8. 19 Cep

Year(Source) Filter(n)	q/dq (%)	u/du (%)	p/dp (%)	$\theta/d\theta$ ($^{\circ}$)	dpi (%)	$d\theta i$ ($^{\circ}$)
1949–1958(1)						
$B(1)$	-0.79/0.20	0.66/0.20	1.03/0.20	70.0/ 5.6	0.20	5.6
1986.65(6)						
$B(2)$	-0.96/0.02	0.78/0.03	1.23/0.00	70.5/ 0.9	0.01	0.2
$V(6)$	-0.88/0.04	0.78/0.07	1.18/0.02	69.2/ 1.9	0.01	0.3
1996.59(7)						
$U(4)$	-0.88/0.12	0.67/0.10	1.12/0.15	71.4/ 0.2	0.12	2.5
$B(4)$	-1.01/0.09	0.60/0.06	1.18/0.10	74.7/ 1.1	0.06	2.0
$V(4)$	-0.90/0.08	0.57/0.08	1.07/0.09	73.9/ 2.1	0.10	1.4
$R(4)$	-0.83/0.04	0.55/0.06	1.01/0.04	73.4/ 1.7	0.04	4.2
$I(4)$	-0.73/0.10	0.45/0.04	0.86/0.10	74.2/ 1.9	0.15	3.8

Table 9. λ Cep

Year(Source) Filter(n)	q/dq (%)	u/du (%)	p/dp (%)	$\theta/d\theta$ ($^\circ$)	dpi (%)	$d\theta i$ ($^\circ$)
1949–1958(1)						
$B(1)$	-0.55/0.20	1.03/0.20	1.17/0.20	59.0/ 4.9	0.20	4.9
1974–1976(3b)						
$B(74)$	-0.48/0.06	1.13/0.06	1.23/0.06	56.4/ 0.9	0.02	0.5
1979–1982(5)						
$V(8)$	-0.52/0.04	1.10/0.04	1.22/0.04	57.7/ 1.4	0.03	0.6
$R(8)$	-0.63/0.05	1.17/0.05	1.33/0.05	59.1/ 1.4	0.06	1.5
$I(8)$	-0.48/0.07	1.06/0.07	1.16/0.07	57.2/ 2.3	0.05	1.6
1986.65(6)						
$B(2)$	-0.47/0.01	1.11/0.01	1.20/0.01	56.5/ 0.2	0.01	0.2
$V(5)$	-0.41/0.02	1.14/0.05	1.21/0.05	55.0/ 0.7	0.02	0.4
1987.68(6)						
$V(7)$	-0.48/0.01	1.09/0.03	1.19/0.02	57.0/ 0.4	0.02	0.6
1989.79(6)						
$U(6)$	-0.58/0.09	1.02/0.09	1.17/0.06	59.9/ 2.6	0.08	1.9
$B(24)$	-0.49/0.05	1.10/0.03	1.21/0.04	56.9/ 1.0	0.03	0.7
$V(6)$	-0.51/0.03	1.01/0.19	1.14/0.18	58.7/ 2.0	0.05	1.2
$R(6)$	-0.44/0.04	1.07/0.03	1.16/0.02	56.2/ 1.1	0.03	0.8
$I(6)$	-0.33/0.12	0.88/0.10	0.95/0.10	55.2/ 3.7	0.07	2.2
1991.82(6)						
$V(16)$	-0.46/0.07	1.09/0.04	1.18/0.04	56.3/ 1.7	0.04	1.1
1996.54(7)						
$U(4)$	-0.44/0.10	0.99/0.10	1.09/0.12	56.9/ 2.1	0.12	2.7
$B(4)$	-0.54/0.08	1.07/0.07	1.20/0.08	58.4/ 1.9	0.06	1.5
$V(4)$	-0.53/0.09	1.09/0.05	1.21/0.08	58.1/ 1.5	0.06	2.3
$R(4)$	-0.51/0.08	1.05/0.03	1.17/0.03	57.9/ 2.0	0.07	1.5
$I(4)$	-0.42/0.09	0.90/0.09	1.00/0.11	57.2/ 2.0	0.14	3.6

Table 10. 10 Lac

Year(Source) Filter(n)	q/dq (%)	u/du (%)	p/dp (%)	$\theta/d\theta$ ($^\circ$)	dpi (%)	$d\theta i$ ($^\circ$)
1949–1958(1)						
$B(1)$	-0.49/0.12	0.00/0.12	0.49/0.12	90.0/ 7.0	0.12	7.0
1992.86(6)						
$U(3)$	-0.45/0.08	0.08/0.03	0.46/0.08	84.8/ 2.0	0.05	3.2
$B(3)$	-0.50/0.04	0.10/0.06	0.52/0.02	84.1/ 3.7	0.04	1.9
$V(18)$	-0.52/0.03	0.04/0.03	0.52/0.03	87.9/ 1.6	0.04	1.2
$R(3)$	-0.52/0.06	0.01/0.02	0.52/0.06	89.6/ 1.3	0.04	2.0
$I(3)$	-0.47/0.05	0.03/0.04	0.47/0.05	88.3/ 2.1	0.04	2.4
1996.59(7)						
$U(4)$	-0.39/0.03	-0.01/0.10	0.41/0.03	90.4/ 7.5	0.07	6.7
$B(4)$	-0.52/0.07	-0.10/0.07	0.54/0.06	95.6/ 4.0	0.06	4.6
$V(4)$	-0.53/0.05	-0.07/0.05	0.54/0.05	93.7/ 2.7	0.05	5.2
$R(4)$	-0.50/0.07	-0.06/0.03	0.52/0.08	93.3/ 1.2	0.06	5.9
$I(4)$	-0.48/0.08	-0.10/0.06	0.52/0.05	95.9/ 4.0	0.14	9.4

Table 11. Statistical Summary

Star Filter	q/dq (%)	$\langle dq \rangle$ (%)	u/du (%)	$\langle du \rangle$ (%)	p/dp (%)	$\langle dp \rangle$ (%)	$\theta/d\theta$ ($^\circ$)	$\langle d\theta \rangle$ ($^\circ$)	$\langle dpi \rangle$ (%)	$\langle d\theta i \rangle$ ($^\circ$)
ξ Per										
U	-0.88/0.07	0.08	-0.60/0.04	0.09	1.07/0.07	0.09	107.2/ 0.9	1.7	0.11	1.5
B	-1.02/0.08	0.08	-0.73/0.08	0.10	1.26/0.08	0.09	107.8/ 1.8	2.0	0.09	2.2
V	-1.09/0.06	0.06	-0.82/0.06	0.07	1.37/0.08	0.06	108.5/ 0.8	1.6	0.05	1.5
R	-1.13/0.05	0.08	-0.82/0.10	0.05	1.40/0.09	0.07	108.0/ 1.2	1.2	0.08	2.0
I	-1.03/0.04	0.08	-0.73/0.05	0.10	1.26/0.04	0.05	107.6/ 1.3	2.4	0.07	2.2
GAV	$\dots$ /0.06	0.07	$\dots$ /0.07	0.08	$\dots$ /0.07	0.07	$\dots$ / 1.2	1.8	0.08	1.9
α Cam										
U	0.18/0.03	0.10	-1.52/0.21	0.12	1.53/0.21	0.12	138.4/ 0.0	2.7	0.11	1.8
B	0.23/0.09	0.11	-1.60/0.10	0.12	1.62/0.11	0.11	139.0/ 1.4	1.7	0.09	1.5
V	0.13/0.11	0.08	-1.58/0.21	0.08	1.59/0.21	0.08	137.2/ 1.7	1.5	0.06	0.9
R	0.09/0.06	0.11	-1.47/0.10	0.13	1.48/0.10	0.12	136.7/ 1.3	1.5	0.06	1.2
I	0.06/0.03	0.08	-1.23/0.15	0.08	1.24/0.15	0.08	136.4/ 0.8	2.1	0.06	2.0
GAV	$\dots$ /0.06	0.10	$\dots$ /0.16	0.11	$\dots$ /0.15	0.10	$\dots$ / 1.1	1.9	0.08	1.5
λ Ori										
U	-0.23/0.02	0.02	-0.14/0.05	0.08	0.28/0.04	0.05	104.0/ 3.1	6.0	0.04	5.4
B	-0.23/0.05	0.07	-0.17/0.05	0.08	0.30/0.06	0.07	108.2/ 5.8	8.2	0.07	8.8
V	-0.25/0.02	0.04	-0.14/0.03	0.05	0.31/0.01	0.04	104.4/ 3.2	4.7	0.03	6.8
R	-0.25/0.03	0.05	-0.11/0.02	0.05	0.28/0.05	0.06	102.1/ 0.1	4.9	0.03	5.3
I	-0.25/0.03	0.05	-0.06/0.01	0.08	0.28/0.06	0.05	97.1/ 0.6	7.9	0.05	7.1
GAV	$\dots$ /0.03	0.05	$\dots$ /0.03	0.07	$\dots$ /0.04	0.05	$\dots$ / 2.6	6.3	0.04	6.7
ζ Ori										
U	-0.19/0.06	0.06	0.06/0.05	0.06	0.23/0.07	0.05	77.3/ 6.4	8.0	0.05	6.6
B	-0.19/0.06	0.11	0.07/0.07	0.06	0.23/0.04	0.08	79.2/12.1	12.6	0.07	13.6
V	-0.25/0.11	0.07	0.10/0.03	0.05	0.29/0.09	0.06	79.8/ 5.6	7.2	0.04	10.2
R	-0.20/0.01	0.06	0.09/0.01	0.06	0.23/0.02	0.08	80.4/ 1.1	7.2	0.05	6.9
I	-0.17/0.08	0.09	0.11/0.11	0.05	0.25/0.04	0.08	73.3/19.2	8.2	0.04	10.2
GAV	$\dots$ /0.06	0.08	$\dots$ /0.05	0.06	$\dots$ /0.05	0.07	$\dots$ / 8.9	8.6	0.05	9.5
ζ Oph										
U	-0.24/0.05	0.05	-1.05/0.07	0.06	1.08/0.07	0.06	128.6/ 1.2	0.7	0.05	1.1
B	-0.34/0.04	0.04	-1.27/0.07	0.04	1.31/0.07	0.04	127.6/ 0.8	0.8	0.04	0.9
V	-0.46/0.10	0.03	-1.39/0.05	0.02	1.47/0.03	0.02	125.9/ 2.0	0.7	0.04	0.7

Table 11—Continued

Star Filter	q/dq (%)	$\langle dq \rangle$ (%)	u/du (%)	$\langle du \rangle$ (%)	p/dp (%)	$\langle dp \rangle$ (%)	$\theta/d\theta$ ($^\circ$)	$\langle d\theta \rangle$ ($^\circ$)	$\langle dpi \rangle$ (%)	$\langle d\theta i \rangle$ ($^\circ$)
<i>R</i>	-0.45/0.11	0.04	-1.39/0.05	0.04	1.46/0.04	0.05	126.0/ 2.2	0.6	0.04	0.7
<i>I</i>	-0.45/0.09	0.03	-1.29/0.12	0.04	1.37/0.14	0.04	125.5/ 1.3	0.8	0.04	1.1
GAV	... /0.08	0.04	... /0.07	0.04	... /0.07	0.04	... / 1.5	0.7	0.04	0.9
68 Cyg										
<i>U</i>	-0.28/0.05	0.04	0.47/0.06	0.06	0.56/0.05	0.05	60.3/ 3.4	2.6	0.09	4.6
<i>B</i>	-0.29/0.10	0.06	0.44/0.06	0.07	0.54/0.10	0.06	61.1/ 3.9	4.7	0.07	4.5
<i>V</i>	-0.34/0.05	0.04	0.51/0.02	0.04	0.62/0.03	0.03	61.7/ 2.3	2.0	0.05	1.8
<i>R</i>	-0.37/0.03	0.04	0.48/0.05	0.04	0.61/0.04	0.04	63.7/ 2.2	2.1	0.04	2.0
<i>I</i>	-0.36/0.06	0.06	0.45/0.05	0.07	0.58/0.02	0.08	64.0/ 3.5	2.2	0.09	4.9
GAV	... /0.06	0.05	... /0.05	0.06	... /0.05	0.05	... / 3.1	2.7	0.07	3.5
19 Cep										
<i>U</i>	-0.88/0.00	0.12	0.67/0.00	0.10	1.12/0.00	0.15	71.4/ 0.0	0.2	0.12	2.5
<i>B</i>	-0.92/0.12	0.10	0.68/0.09	0.10	1.15/0.10	0.10	71.7/ 2.6	2.5	0.09	2.6
<i>V</i>	-0.89/0.01	0.06	0.67/0.15	0.08	1.12/0.08	0.05	71.6/ 3.3	2.0	0.05	0.9
<i>R</i>	-0.83/0.00	0.04	0.55/0.00	0.06	1.01/0.00	0.04	73.4/ 0.0	1.7	0.04	4.2
<i>I</i>	-0.73/0.00	0.10	0.45/0.00	0.04	0.86/0.00	0.10	74.2/ 0.0	1.9	0.15	3.8
GAV	... /0.03	0.08	... /0.05	0.07	... /0.04	0.09	... / 1.2	1.7	0.09	2.8
λ Cep										
<i>U</i>	-0.51/0.10	0.09	1.00/0.02	0.09	1.13/0.06	0.09	58.4/ 2.1	2.3	0.10	2.3
<i>B</i>	-0.51/0.04	0.08	1.09/0.04	0.07	1.20/0.02	0.08	57.4/ 1.2	1.8	0.06	1.6
<i>V</i>	-0.48/0.05	0.04	1.09/0.04	0.07	1.19/0.03	0.07	57.1/ 1.3	1.3	0.04	1.0
<i>R</i>	-0.53/0.10	0.06	1.10/0.06	0.04	1.22/0.10	0.03	57.7/ 1.5	1.5	0.05	1.3
<i>I</i>	-0.41/0.08	0.09	0.95/0.10	0.09	1.04/0.11	0.09	56.5/ 1.2	2.7	0.09	2.5
GAV	... /0.07	0.07	... /0.05	0.07	... /0.06	0.07	... / 1.5	1.9	0.07	1.7
10 Lac										
<i>U</i>	-0.42/0.04	0.05	-0.04/0.05	0.06	0.44/0.04	0.05	87.6/ 4.0	4.8	0.06	4.9
<i>B</i>	-0.50/0.02	0.08	-0.07/0.06	0.08	0.52/0.03	0.07	89.9/ 5.8	4.9	0.07	4.5
<i>V</i>	-0.52/0.01	0.04	-0.05/0.02	0.04	0.53/0.01	0.04	90.8/ 4.1	2.2	0.05	3.2
<i>R</i>	-0.51/0.01	0.06	-0.04/0.04	0.02	0.52/0.00	0.07	91.4/ 2.6	1.2	0.05	4.0
<i>I</i>	-0.47/0.01	0.06	-0.06/0.05	0.05	0.50/0.04	0.05	92.1/ 5.4	3.0	0.09	5.9
GAV	... /0.02	0.06	... /0.04	0.05	... /0.02	0.06	... / 4.4	3.2	0.06	4.5

This figure "dmdfig1.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9909456v1>

This figure "dmdfig2.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9909456v1>

This figure "dmdfig3.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9909456v1>

This figure "dmdfig4.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9909456v1>

This figure "dmdfig5.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9909456v1>

This figure "dmdfig6.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9909456v1>

This figure "dmdfig7.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9909456v1>

This figure "dmdfig8.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9909456v1>

This figure "dmdfig9.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9909456v1>

This figure "dmdfig10.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9909456v1>

This figure "dmdfig11.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9909456v1>

This figure "dmdfig12.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9909456v1>